$~17 & 18

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\+ W.P.(C) Nos. 8930/2017 & 8931/2017

CONCEPT TRADEHOME PVT. LTD ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Suhail Anjum Siddiqui, Mr. M.A. Ansari and Mr. Khursheed Ahmed, Advocates.

Versus

COMMISSIONER OF VAT & ANR. ..... Respondent
Through Mr. Rahul Sharma and Mr. C.K. Bhatt, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

O R D E R

% **07.12.2017**

Counsel for the respondents, on instructions, states that objections under Section 59(2) of the Delhi Value Added Tax Act, 2004, were uploaded on the portal of the petitioner on 27th July, 2017.

Authorized representative of the petitioner, as per the original file produced before us, had attended the proceedings on different dates beginning from 24th July, 2017. It is also stated that notice/order of default assessment dated 13th November, 2017 has been issued.

The original file has been shown to the counsel for the petitioner, who accepts that in the writ petition the said details and particulars have not been mentioned. It is stated that the authorized representative of the petitioner may have appeared, but the counsel who is appearing in the present writ petition did not have knowledge and was not aware of the said position.

In view of what has transpired, we dismiss the writ petition giving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order dated 13th November, 2017 in accordance with law. However, the petitioner would pay consolidated costs of Rs.20,000/- to the respondents.

SANJIV KHANNA, J.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

DECEMBER 07, 2017
NA